



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/702,043

11/06/2003

Hideki Hashizume

02410346AA

7421

30743 7590 07/12/2007
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

CHIEM, DINH D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2883

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/702,043

Applicant(s)

HASHIZUME ET AL.

Examiner

Erin D. Chiem

Art Unit

2883

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 24, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 6, and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: The variable $A^{1/2}$ is undefined in the claims, thus unclear. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5-7, 11-12, and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (US Patent 6,084,994) in view of Kittaka et al. (US 2002/0140929 A1). Li teaches in Figures 2, 5, and 6 a wavelength selective optical device comprising a first optical fiber 102 in which optical signals with a plurality of multiplexed wavelengths is propagated; a first graded

index rod lens 120 having a first end surface thereof on which a light emitted from an end surface of the first optical fiber is incident, and a second end surface thereof from which a parallel light beam is emitted; an optical filter 130 arranged to face to the second end of the surface of the first graded index rod lens so that the parallel light beam emitted from the first graded index rod lens is incident on the optical filter; a second graded index rod lens 140 having a first end surface thereof facing to the first optical fiber; and a second optical fiber 160 arranged on a side of a second end surface of the second graded index rod lens, wherein the refractive index distribution constant of the rod lens is adjusted such that a wavelength range of the light transmitted from the optical filter is tuned within a desired range (col. 4, lines 57-59). The Examiner, respectfully, point out that the shift of refractive index distribution constant to the desired range is the purpose of employing an optical filter such as one taught by Li.

However, Li does not explicitly disclose an angle of the parallel light incident on the optical filter is adjusted by changing a refractive index distribution constant of the first graded index rod lens.

Kittaka discloses the method of determining the refractive index distribution constant of a rod lens by experimentation and solving a light ray equation (par. [0006]).

Li and Kittaka are from the same field of endeavor.

The motivation for determining the refractive index distribution constant of a rod lens is to apply the rod lens in the best application when the refractive index distribution constant is known. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to recognize the incident light would be changed when the refractive index distribution constant of the graded index rod lens is changed since, the method disclosed by Kittaka is determined by the focus on

Art Unit: 2883

the lens of the opposite side of the incident side. Furthermore, it is respectfully pointed out that Applicant has not functionally enabled the claim to define how the optical device changes the refractive index distribution constant of the graded index rod lens. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a rod lens having the refractive index distribution constant such that it complements the desired incident light angle.

Regarding claims 5, 11, and 15 the selection of one from a plurality of graded index rod lens groups having various different refractive index distribution constants is a mere fact of one of ordinary skill in the art when embarking on selecting the correct lens to use, the limitation is comparable to one of ordinary skill in the art to open a catalog of optical lens having various refractive index distribution constants to select from.

Claims 2-4, 8-9, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Kittaka and in further view of Cearns et al. (US Patent 5,943,149).

Li and Kittaka teach in Figures 2, 5, and 6 a wavelength selective optical device comprising a first optical fiber 102 in which optical signals with a plurality of multiplexed wavelengths is propagated; a first graded index rod lens 120 having a first end surface thereof on which a light emitted from an end surface of the first optical fiber is incident, and a second end surface thereof from which a parallel light beam is emitted; an optical filter 130 formed directly on to the second end of the surface of the first graded index rod lens so that the parallel light beam emitted from the first graded index rod lens is incident on the optical filter; a second graded index rod lens 140 having a first end surface thereof facing to the first optical fiber; and a second optical fiber 160 arranged on a side of a second end surface of the second graded index rod lens, wherein the refractive index distribution constant of the rod lens is adjusted such that a

Art Unit: 2883

wavelength range of the light transmitted from the optical filter is tuned within a desired range (col. 4, lines 57-59).

However neither Li nor Kittaka explicitly teach the optical filter is a multi-layered optical filter.

Cearns teaches a wavelength selective optical device comprising a lens 310 and directly in contact with a multilayer dielectric filter 305 and the multilayer dielectric filter is in direct contact with another lens 310 for the purpose of easy manufacturing and allows the optical arrangement to occupy less space.

Since Li, Kittaka, and Cearns are all from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Cearns would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Li and Kittaka.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ multi-layered optical filter versus a separately independent filter such as a crystal, by directly apply the multi-layered optical filter onto the second end surface of the rod lens, similar to the optical filter directly contacted to the rod lens taught by Li.

The motivation for employing multi-layered optical filter is for the purpose of easy manufacturing and allows the optical arrangement to occupy less space.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on March 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's ONLY argument is as follows:

Art Unit: 2883

- The amended limitation “or another graded index rod lens having a different $A^{1/2}$ than an $A^{1/2}$ of the replaceable first graded index rod lens” overcame the prior art of record.
- The prior art of record in combination does not provide a prima facie case of obviousness with regards the limitation of the “replaceable first graded index rod lens.”

Examiner’s responses to Applicant’s ONLY arguments are as follows:

- The amended limitation is recited in the alternative, thus the rejection made on January 4, 2007 is still applicable on the original recitation.
- Regarding the limitation “a replaceable first graded index rod lens,” the examiner considers the capability of replacing the first graded index rod lens occur during manufacturing since the claim does not distinguish the replaceability is an end-user feature or a manufacturing step. The claim does not distinguish that *after* assembly the first rod lens may be removed and replaced by another rod lens. Therefore, examiner considers the replaceability of the claim recitation occurs during manufacturing process, such as in the case when a defective rod lens is found, the said rod lens is replaced by another operable rod lens.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erin D. Chiem whose telephone number is (571) 272-3102. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 9AM - 5PM.

Art Unit: 2883

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G. Font can be reached on (571) 272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Erin D Chiem
Examiner
Art Unit 2883



Frank G. Font
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800